REMARKS

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1-19, as amended, are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 9, 11 and 16 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and use the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 11 and 16 by replacing the phrase "values of said settings correctly" with –correct setting information-- in order that one skilled in the art to which it pertains can make and use the claimed invention.

The amendment to claims 1, 5, 11 and 16 is supported at page 12, lines 25-30 of the application, at which point in the application, the help list is described as "an explanation of conceivable reasons why a function or service may be inoperable, presented in text form, advising the user of correct setting information needed to execute the corresponding function or ....". In view of the amendment to claims 1, 5, 11 and 16, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 1, 5, 11 and 16.

Further, since claims 2-4, 6-8, 12-15 and 17-19 depend respectively from claims 1, 5, 11 and 16, Applicant submits that claims 2-4, 6-8, 12-15 and 17-19 are allowable at least by their dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 2-4, 6-8, 12-15 and 17-19. .

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,345 (Siegel). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended claim 9 now recites:

> *A device that carries out a plurality of functions or services*
> *according to a plurality of settings, and has a help function, comprising:*
> > *a setting memory storing the settings used when each one of*
> *said functions or services is performed;*
> > *a reference unit storing a table relating the setting in the*
> *setting memory to the functions or services in which the settings are used;*
> > *a searching unit for determining which function or service*
> *was being attempted when the device failed to operate correctly, referring*
> *to the table in the reference unit, and finding the settings, in the setting*
> *memory, corresponding to said function or service that was being*
> *attempted when the device failed to operate correctly; and*
> > *a prompting unit for prompting a modification of the*
> *settings found by the searching unit.*

The preferred embodiment of the present invention is directed to detecting a failure of a device service or function <u>at the time the function or service provided by the device is executed.</u> When a function or service fails to operate correctly, <u>a reference unit</u> uses information related to unexecuted operations in the function or service to find the address of an applicable help list in a first memory. A memory reading unit then reads the help list from a second memory. A prompting unit prompts a user to alter setting of the function or service.

In rejecting claim 9, the Examiner cites Siegel *et al.*, col. 7, lines 11-29 as disclosing a searching unit for determining which function or service was being attempted when the device failed to operate correctly and finding the settings corresponding to the function or service. The cited lines list a variety of diagnostic/prognostic technologies, and so on to say that "Based on this initial diagnosis, the preliminary analysis circuit routine (160) determines if the electronic system (100) is operating satisfactorily, or whether further analysis is required. Accordingly, *Siegel et al.* teaches a searching unit that searches for as yet unknown problems in an electronic system by the initiation of a diagnostic or test mode to extract information that is otherwise unavailable during normal device operation (col. 5, lines 39-44).

The times at which searching is performed by Siegel *et al.* are unrelated to the occurrence of a problem. Thus while Siegel *et al.* may detect that a problem has or will occur

based on the values of certain parameters, Siegel *et al.* can not possibly find the values of settings of the functions <u>at the times of the failures</u> unless a continuum of settings values are stored over time. The continuing storing of setting values for the purpose of finding the values of settings at the time that a failure occurs is neither taught or suggested by Siegel *et al.*

In contrast to the searching disclosed by Siegel *et al.*, the claimed searching unit is <u>event driven</u>. That is, the claimed searching unit detects failed functions and services <u>as they occur</u> and what settings for the function or service were being employed <u>at the time of the failure</u>.

Siegel *et al.* also fails to describe a reference unit storing a table relating the settings in the setting memory to the functions or services in which the settings are used as recited in amended claim 9.

The Examiner also finds a prompting unit for prompting a modification of the settings found by the searching unit in col. 8, lines 2-19. However, these lines describe the sending of a revised set of operating instructions to the electronic system. Siegel *et al.* does not specifically teach prompting for modification of the settings stored in the setting memory (which the Examiner found in col. 5, lines 1-45 and col. 6, lines 61-62).

In summary, Siegel *et al.* discloses a diagnostic system which collects data from a device at times dictated by a fixed program or by external events and analyses the data to determine the status of the device. In contrast, amended claim 9 recites detecting a failure of the device <u>when the failure occurs</u>. Further, amended claim 9 recites a reference unit which stores a table that relates settings in the setting unit to functions and services performed by the device. There is no teaching or suggestion in Siegel *et al.* of a reference unit, as recited in amended claim 9.

Applicant submits that Siegel *et al.* does not teach or suggest all the limitations of amended claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 9.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since amended claim 9 has been shown to be allowable, claim10 dependent on claim 9 is allowable, at least by its dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim10.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's objections and rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application, including claims 1-19, is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 1-19 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ATSUSHI OWARI

February 2, 2005   By:

(Date)

LOUIS SICKLES II
Registration No. 45,803
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013
Telephone: 215-965-1200
Direct Dial: 215-965-1294
Facsimile: 215-965-1210
E-Mail: lsickles@akingump.com

LS:lcd